

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Applicant amends claim 2 to depend from claim 1, and amends claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 11-16 for further clarification. Applicant refers to page 24, line 9 to page 25, line 11 of the specification for exemplary embodiments of and support for the claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to the specification without specifying any grounds for such objection. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide reasons for or withdraw the objection.

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 7 for apparent informalities, which Applicant corrects by amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Claims 1 and 3-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

Applicant amends claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 11 to address the antecedent basis and clarity issues enumerated by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the § 112, ¶ 2 rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by “Mobile IP” by Perkins; claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,987,771 to Shimizu et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,323 to Foti; claims 6, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkins in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133598 to Strahm et al. Applicant amends claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, and 11-16 in a good faith effort to further clarify the invention as distinguished from the cited references, and respectfully traverses the rejections.

Perkins, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, does not include any disclosure of

a session manager keeping both first and second session connections before and after switching from one to the other.

In other words, Perkins, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, fails to disclose,

“[a] server disposed in a packet network to repeat a packet between a first terminal and a second terminal, comprising:

a session managing unit storing a first address of said first terminal assigned to a first session representing a first connection status between said server and said first terminal and a second address of said first terminal assigned to a second session representing a second connection status between said server and said first terminal;

a receiving unit receiving a packet containing user data from said second terminal;

a switching unit switching from said first session having said first address as a destination to said second session having said second address as the destination on the basis of said addresses stored in said session managing unit; and

a transmitting unit transmitting said packet using said second session switched by said switching unit, wherein said session managing unit does not release said first session after said switching.” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, together with claims 3 and 5 dependent therefrom, is patentable over Perkins for at least the above-stated reasons. Claims 7-8, 13, and 15-16 incorporate features that correspond to those of claim 1 cited above, and are, therefore, together with claims 9, 11, and 14 dependent therefrom, respectively, patentable over Perkins for at least the same reasons. The Examiner cited Shimizu et al., Foti, and Strahm et al. as combining references to specifically address the additional features recited in claims 2, 4, 6, 10, and 12, respectively. As such, combinations with Shimizu et al., Foti, and Strahm et al. would still have failed to cure the above-described deficiencies of Perkins. Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend from claim 1, claim 10 depends from claim 7, and claim 12 incorporates features that correspond to those of claim 1 cited above. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 6, 10, and 12 are patentable over the cited references for at least the above-stated reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter T. Chang/

Dexter T. Chang

Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: 100794-00537 (FUJS 20.865)
DTC:tb